

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 176, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

YEAS—239

Aderholt	Gosar	Pearce
Alexander	Growdy	Perry
Amash	Granger	Peters (CA)
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Peterson
Bachmann	Graves (MO)	Petri
Bachus	Griffin (AR)	Pittenger
Barber	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Barletta	Grimm	Poe (TX)
Barr	Guthrie	Pompeo
Barrow (GA)	Hall	Posey
Barton	Hanna	Price (GA)
Benishek	Harper	Reed
Bentivolio	Harris	Reichert
Bera (CA)	Hartzler	Renacci
Billrakis	Hastings (WA)	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Heck (NV)	Rice (SC)
Black	Hensarling	Rigell
Blackburn	Holding	Roby
Bonner	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Hurt	Rokita
Broun (GA)	Issa	Rooney
Buchanan	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Calvert	Jordan	Rothfus
Camp	Joyce	Royce
Cantor	Kelly (PA)	Ruiz
Capito	King (NY)	Runyan
Carter	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	Kinzinger (IL)	Salmon
Chabot	Kline	Sanford
Chaffetz	Labrador	Scalise
Coble	LaMalfa	Schock
Coffman	Lamborn	Schweikert
Cole	Lance	Scott, Austin
Collins (NY)	Lankford	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Latham	Sessions
Cook	Latta	Shimkus
Cotton	LoBiondo	Shuster
Cramer	Long	Simpson
Crawford	Lucas	Sinema
Crenshaw	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Cuellar	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Maffei	Smith (NJ)
Daines	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Davis, Rodney	Marino	Southerland
Denham	Massie	Stewart
Dent	Matheson	Stivers
DeSantis	McCarthy (CA)	Stockman
DesJarlais	McCaul	Stutzman
Diaz-Balart	McClintock	Terry
Duffy	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (SC)	McIntyre	Thornberry
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Tiberi
Ellmers	McKinley	Tipton
Farenthold	McMorris	Turner
Fincher	Rodgers	Upton
Fitzpatrick	McNerney	Valadao
Fleischmann	Meadows	Wagner
Fleming	Meehan	Walberg
Flores	Messer	Walden
Forbes	Mica	Walorski
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Weber (TX)
Fox	Miller, Gary	Webster (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Wenstrup
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Galleo	Murphy (FL)	Whitfield
Garcia	Murphy (PA)	Williams
Gardner	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Noem	Wittman
Gerlach	Nugent	Womack
Gibbs	Nunes	Woodall
Gibson	Nunnelee	Yoder
Gingrey (GA)	Olson	Yoho
Gohmert	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Paulsen	Young (IN)

NAYS—176

Andrews	Braley (IA)	Carson (IN)
Bass	Brown (FL)	Cartwright
Beatty	Brownley (CA)	Castor (FL)
Becerra	Bustos	Castro (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Butterfield	Chu
Bishop (NY)	Capps	Cicilline
Blumenauer	Capuano	Clarke
Bonamici	Cardenas	Clay
Brady (PA)	Carney	Clyburn

Cohen	Kaptur	Quigley
Connolly	Keating	Rahall
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Rangel
Costa	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Courtney	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Cummings	Kilmer	Rush
Davis (CA)	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Davis, Danny	Kirkpatrick	Sanchez, Linda
DeFazio	Kuster	T.
DeGette	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta
Delaney	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
DelBene	Lee (CA)	Schiff
Deutch	Levin	Schneider
Dingell	Lipinski	Schrader
Doggett	Loeb	Schwartz
Doyle	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
Duckworth	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Edwards	Lowey	Serrano
Ellison	Lujan Grisham	Sewell (AL)
Engel	(NM)	Shea-Porter
Enyart	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sherman
Eshoo	(NM)	Sires
Esty	Lynch	Slaughter
Farr	Maloney,	Smith (WA)
Fattah	Carolyn	Speier
Foster	Maloney, Sean	Swalwell (CA)
Frankel (FL)	Matsui	Takano
Fudge	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Gabbard	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Garamendi	McGovern	Tierney
Grayson	Meeks	Titus
Green, Al	Meng	Tonko
Green, Gene	Michaud	Tsongas
Grijalva	Moore	Van Hollen
Gutiérrez	Moran	Vargas
Hahn	Nadler	Veasey
Hanabusa	Napolitano	Vela
Hastings (FL)	Neal	Velázquez
Heck (WA)	Negrete McLeod	Visclosky
Higgins	Nolan	Walz
Himes	O'Rourke	Wasserman
Hinojosa	Owens	Schultz
Honda	Pascarella	Waters
Hoyer	Pastor (AZ)	Watt
Huffman	Payne	Waxman
Israel	Perlmutter	Welch
Jackson Lee	Peters (MI)	Wilson (FL)
Jeffries	Pingree (ME)	Wolf
Sessions	Pocan	Yarmuth
Johnson (GA)	Polis	
Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)	
Jones		

NOT VOTING—18

Campbell	Holt	Miller, George
Cleaver	Horsford	Pallone
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Pelosi
Conyers	Lewis	Radel
Crowley	McCarthy (NY)	Richmond
Herrera Beutler	Miller (FL)	Young (FL)

□ 1749

Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. PAYNE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. CHAFFETZ changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I attended a meeting at the White House with the President of the United States. As such, I was unfortunately not able to be present for the following vote:

On final passage of H.R. 2879, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I regret that a meeting at the White House caused me to miss the first vote series on August 1, 2013. Had I been present, my intention was to vote as follows on the amendments to H.R. 1582, the Energy Consumers Relief Act: “no” on the Waxman Amendment, “no” on the Connolly Amendment, and “yes” on the Murphy (PA) Amendment. I would have voted “no” on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 1582 and “yes” on

Passage on H.R. 1582. Further I would have voted “yes” on the previous question, “yes” on the combined rule for the REINS Act, Keep IRS Off Health Care Act, and the Stop Government Abuse Act. Finally, I would have voted “yes” on the passage of H.R. 1897, the Vietnam Human Rights Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 9 of House Resolution 322, H.R. 1541, H.R. 2579, and H.R. 2711 are laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 319

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 319. It was put on that resolution inadvertently.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2783

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the name of the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) as a cosponsor from H.R. 2783.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 367.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 322 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 367.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1757

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 367) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, with Mr. HULTGREN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Earlier this month, President Obama announced that he would, once again, pivot to the economy. The bottom line of his speech, after 4½ years of the Obama administration: “We’re not there yet.”

The President is right: we’re not there yet. Economic growth is the key to job creation and recovery, but America’s growth rate is historically anemic. From 2010 through 2012, it averaged barely 2 percent. In the fourth quarter of 2012, growth was just four-tenths of one percent.

In the first two quarters of this year, growth averaged only 1.4 percent according to the most recent estimates. These dismal figures translate into deep economic pain for America’s workers and families.

The June 2013 jobs report showed an increase of 240,000 in the number of discouraged workers, those who have simply quit looking for a job out of frustration or despair.

The number of people working part-time, but who really want full-time work, passed 8.2 million. That represents a jump of 322,000 in just 1 month.

Worst of all, the truest measure of unemployment, the rate that includes both discouraged workers and those who cannot find a full-time job, continues to exceed 20 million Americans. That rate rose from 13.8 percent back to 14.3 in June.

America’s labor force participation rate has fallen to levels not seen since the Carter administration. Median real household income, meanwhile, is 5 percent lower than in June of 2009, when the recession officially ended.

□ 1800

Median incomes are supposed to rise during economic recoveries, not fall. The Obama administration, however, has managed to buck the historical trend. Worse, median incomes remain 9 percent below the peak they reached in January 2008, before the financial crisis. The President is indeed right: we’re not there yet. But what the President missed in his speech is that it is his administration’s policies that are responsible for America still remaining so deep in this economic hole. To see how true that is one only has to look at the historical record.

The current recovery is the weakest on record in the post-World War II era. The contrast with the recovery Ronald Reagan achieved is particularly stark. Four-and-a-half years after the recession began in 1981, the Reagan administration, through policies opposite to

the Obama administration, had achieved a recovery that created 7.9 million more jobs than when the recession began. Real per capita gross domestic product rose by \$3,091. Real median household income rose by 7.7 percent.

Surely, the administration knows this. But instead of fixing the problem by changing its policies, the Obama administration knows only one response: double down, increase taxes, increase spending, and increase regulation.

The number of new major regulations the Obama administration has issued and plans to issue—generally, regulations with more than \$100 million in impacts—is without modern precedent. Testimony before the Judiciary Committee this term and during the 112th Congress has plainly shown the connection between skyrocketing levels of regulation and declining levels of jobs and growth.

To make matters worse, it is increasingly the case that, when Congress refuses to enable the administration’s flawed policies through legislation, the administration unilaterally issues new regulations to achieve an end run around Congress.

The REINS Act is one of the most powerful measures we can adopt to put an end to regulation that wrongheadedly imposes the administration’s flawed policies on the American people. It achieves that result in the simplest and clearest ways—by requiring an up-or-down vote by the people’s representatives in Congress before any new major regulation can be imposed on our economy.

Some say the REINS Act will mean an end to new major regulation, even when regulation is needed. But the REINS Act does not prohibit new major regulation. It simply establishes the principle: no major regulation without representation.

By restoring to Members of Congress, who are accountable to the American people, the responsibility for America’s costliest regulatory decisions, the REINS Act provides Congress and, ultimately, the people with a much-needed tool to check the one-way cost ratchet turned by the Obama administration and Washington’s regulatory bureaucrats.

I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) for introducing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote for the REINS Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 367, the REINS Act of 2013.

As I noted during our extensive debate in the Judiciary Committee on this bill, it reminds me of the movie “Groundhog Day.” I feel like Bill Murray. It’s that day over and over again. We come back to the same bill.

We extensively debated this bill in the last Congress; we debated bills very similar to it in this Congress; and, again, we’re here debating this bill,

which, by any sensible measure and probably a civics student in the 10th grade or less would know that this is a seriously flawed bill that will impede legislation and hurt the American public. It’s based on a premise that regulations by themselves stifle job creation, a rather unique concept that we have come to debate in our committee and now on the floor.

H.R. 367 threatens to undermine vital protections that ensure the safety and soundness of the entire range of societal needs, from food safety to clean air and clean water, to workplace safety, to consumer product safety, to financial stability. It does this by bringing most important Federal rulemakings—including those that protect the public like the Affordable Care Act and the implementation thereof, as well as the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act aimed at keeping us back from the catastrophic days back in 2008 or 2009 when the world was coming to an end because of derivatives—it takes the implementation of these bills to a screeching halt, a result that will put at risk the well-being of millions of Americans, both from fiscal health and physical health.

The REINS Act would require that both Houses of Congress pass and the President sign a joint resolution of approval within 70 legislative days before a major rule can take effect. In the House, a committee of jurisdiction would have but 17 legislative days to consider a joint resolution of approval, after which it would automatically be discharged from the committee and sent to the full House—certainly not enough time to do a good job of reviewing the regulations. The House must consider such a resolution either on the second or fourth Thursday of every month, assuming that the House is even in session on that Thursday.

The bill also defines a “major rule” as one having at least a \$100 million economic impact or having one of a number of other economic impacts. In all, Federal agencies issue about 50 to 100 major rules every year. That means that if the REINS Act had become law this year, there would only be 5 days left in 2013 for the House to consider 50 to 100 major rules. And while the other side loves gas, as we’ve seen with the farm bill and THUD, they can’t pass it.

Given those traps set forth in the bill, no major rule would ever go into effect. This, in turn, threatens agencies’ ability to protect Americans’ health, safety, and well-being. It’s a way of stifling the opportunity to protect Americans.

Another concern with the REINS Act is the influence of industry lobbyists over rulemaking would tremendously increase. K Street would love it. Given the complexity of the rules at issue and the expedited timeframe for congressional consideration, Members would instead be bombarded with visits, phone calls, and talking points from industry lobbyists, who would no doubt

take advantage of the REINS Act's short-circuited process to shape Members' views about a particular rule, probably within days of a major fundraiser.

On top of all the problems with this bill, it is simply unnecessary. First, to the extent that its proponents are concerned with Congress's accountability for agency rules, there are already numerous tools at our disposal to shape agency rulemaking. For example, Congress can rescind or limit its delegation authority to an agency if an agency acts beyond what we intended. Congress can also disapprove a rule under the Congressional Review Act process, defund enforcement of a rule or an agency through its appropriations and authorization power, overturn specific rules through legislation, and conduct regular oversight activity.

Second, to the extent that the REINS Act's proponents claim that the bill is necessary because the Obama administration has inundated the country with costly regulations, the facts simply do not bear this out. Just because you say "Obama" doesn't mean it's bad. Most Americans like Obama. He's been elected President twice.

In an op-ed that appeared in the *Memphis Commercial Appeal*, Doyle McManus cited Cass Sunstein, former director of OIRA, known as the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, who noted that in President Obama's "first 4 years in office, he has issued fewer new Federal regulations than any of the four Presidents who came before him, including Ronald Reagan."

Moreover, the op-ed noted that this President has revoked "hundreds of outmoded rules that produced savings for government, business, and consumers that will add up to billions."

Congress has already considered and rejected congressional approval schemes in the past. For instance, Chief Justice John Roberts—not exactly a flaming liberal—criticized legislation that was similar to the REINS Act back in 1983 when he was an associate White House counsel. In a memorandum, he objected that such legislation would "hobble agency rulemaking by requiring affirmative congressional assent to all major rules" and would "seem to impose excessive burdens on the regulatory agencies."

So before Chief Justice Roberts saved the ACA, he spoke out on this legislation as well in giving us wise counsel.

Finally, the broader premise underlying the REINS Act—that regulation stifles economic growth and job creation—is simply false.

It's pretty incredible that the proponents of antiregulatory bills like the REINS Act continue to make this claim in light of the fact there's absolutely no credible evidence establishing the fact that regulations have any substantive impact on job creation. But do not just take my word for it. Listen to some respected Republicans and conservatives.

Bruce Bartlett, a senior policy analyst in the Reagan and George H.W. Bush administrations, said:

Republicans have a problem. People are increasingly concerned about unemployment, but Republicans have nothing to offer them. The GOP opposes additional government spending for jobs programs and, in fact, favors big cuts in spending that would likely lead to further layoffs at all levels of government. These constraints have led Republicans to embrace the idea that government regulation is the principal factor holding back employment. They assert that Barack Obama unleashed a tidal wave of new regulations, which has created uncertainty among businesses and prevents them from investing and hiring.

He concludes:

No hard evidence is offered for this claim. It is simply asserted as self-evident and repeated throughout the conservative echo chamber.

It's as if you say it enough, people will believe it.

On the related argument that regulations create business uncertainty, Mr. Bartlett has said:

Regulatory uncertainty is a canard invented by Republicans that allows them to use current economic problems to pursue an agenda supported by the business community year in and year out. In other words, it is a simple case of political opportunism, not a serious effort to deal with high unemployment.

That was Bruce Bartlett from the Reagan and George H.W. Bush days.

Susan Dudley, who headed the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs during the administration of George W. Bush, has been quoted as saying that it is "hard to know what the real impacts of regulation are." She also stated that she was unaware of any "empirically sound way to assess the impact that proposed rules have on jobs."

During one of the many hearings held on this issue in the last Congress, the majority's own witness clearly debunked the myth that regulations stymie job creation. Christopher DeMuth, with the conservative American Enterprise Institute, stated in his prepared testimony that "the focus on jobs . . . can lead to confusion and regulatory debates" and that "the employment effects of regulation, while important, are indeterminate."

The REINS Act is seriously flawed in its very conception and based on false premises that regulation kills jobs. Ultimately, it will only serve to needlessly heighten risks to the health and safety—financial and physical—of the American people. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in opposition to H.R. 367, which I feel confident will pass this House and meet a timely death before it gets to see the light of day in the Senate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 367, the REINS Act.

Some of my Democrat friends want to characterize this bill as an antiregulation bill. But a vote for the REINS Act isn't a vote against regulations. It's a vote for better regulations. It's a vote in favor of a smarter regulatory system. It's a vote to balance broad economic interests against the narrow jurisdiction of individual Federal agencies. It's a vote to give the people most affected by regulations a louder voice in the democratic process.

Yesterday, the White House threatened to veto this bill if it passes. In their veto threat, they wrote:

Maintaining an appropriate allocation of responsibility between the two branches is essential to ensuring that the Nation's regulatory system effectively protects public health, welfare, safety, and our environment, while also promoting economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation.

I couldn't agree more. That's exactly why I introduced this bill in January. For those, like me, who are truly concerned about maintaining an appropriate allocation of responsibility between the two branches, regardless of who occupies the White House, it's worth noting the executive branch only derives its power and only invokes its responsibility to issue a given legislation when the legislative branches authorize it to do so, and only in accordance with legislation passed by Congress.

However, this "allocation of responsibility" has been thrown out of whack because Congress has taken to the habit of passing sweeping, ambiguous laws that leave it to Federal agencies to sort out the details. This is typically done for the purpose of rushing bills through Congress in order to meet a political timetable or because certain Members would prefer to avoid working through the controversial details. It's much easier to leave such decisions to unaccountable rulemakers, after all.

ObamaCare is a great example of this phenomenon. As the minority leader said when she served as Speaker:

We have to pass the bill so you can find out what is in it.

It turns out that's exactly the case. They had to pass the bill so HHS, the IRS, and our veritable alphabet soup of Federal agencies could tell us how the law would actually work. In fact, we still don't know exactly what's in the bill because we're still waiting on more regulations.

□ 1815

If the REINS Act were in place, none of the major regulations that are issued for ObamaCare or other sweeping laws would take effect until Congress approved them. This would make our regulatory process smarter for a number of reasons—chiefly, because we currently regulate in silos.

Now, when HHS employees are drafting a regulation about health insurance, for instance, they narrowly focus only on insurance. They aren't too worried about economic growth. If the IRS is drafting a regulation on tax collection, they are likely to focus narrowly on taxes. They don't take much

into account job losses and income effects.

We need a Congress that can comprehensively look at these things, a body that can, in the words of the White House, “protect public health, welfare, safety, and our environment, while also promoting economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation,” all at the same time.

So as we learn what’s actually in ObamaCare and other laws, why is it such a bad idea to ensure that individual, rank-and-file Americans get to weigh in, through their elected representatives, on the important details that impact their pocketbooks, consume their time, and govern countless aspects of their daily lives?

The truth is it’s not a bad idea. In fact, I predict Congress would take the time to more thoroughly and publicly deliberate about these large ambiguous bills if the regulators didn’t get the final say. In the end, we would end up with better, clearer legislation in a diminished role for unelected rulemakers. More Americans could stay engaged in the entire lawmaking process and could voice their concerns in a meaningful way. And politicians would be unable to hide behind so-called “unelected bureaucrats” because the American people could ultimately hold Congress accountable for the rules coming out of Washington.

I implore my colleagues to join me in restoring a measure of accountability to the democratic process. Support this bill.

The CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROTHFUS) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent Resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2013

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to set the frame for where we are.

What we’re asking is for all major rules and regulations to have to be approved by both the House and the Senate and signed by the President before they would ever go into effect. That message is one of the few things we can agree on—the Senate agreed on the time we can adjourn. That’s about what we agree on. Seventeen bills have made it through here in 7 months, and

we’re talking about 50 to 100 major rules. Not gonna happen.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend from Tennessee, and I thank him for his able leadership on this bill.

Listening to our friends on the other side of the aisle, I urge them all to reread Upton Sinclair’s “The Jungle,” because that’s where you would take us. You would take us to a world in which there was no Federal oversight of the food supply in America, there was no oversight of child labor in America, there was no oversight of workplace safety in America. And tragedies ensued.

America’s water, America’s air is cleaner, more breathable, and healthier today precisely because of regulation. The narrative that all regulation is burdensome—it only entails a cost, it never entails a benefit—is absolutely false and needs to be rejected by this body.

Sadly, Mr. Chairman, it is once again shaping up to be a lost summer for Congress as a number of issues ripe for debate—not this one—will be left to wither on the vine as Members leave town for the next 5 weeks. That’s frustrating, after this year began with so much promise.

I was pleased to be part of a bipartisan coalition that voted for the New Year’s Day deal to avert the fiscal cliff. A few weeks later, that same bipartisan coalition banded together to provide emergency aid to communities ravaged by Superstorm Sandy. Thankfully, our success didn’t stop even there. We came together again on a bipartisan basis to reaffirm the strong support for the Violence Against Women Act after it had languished in this body because leadership refused to compromise.

At that point, people were actually beginning to wonder if the 113th Congress had finally gotten the message—that the American people want us to work together to get things done, not to just make cheap political points. But sadly, that progress was not sustained.

The first fissure appeared after the Senate’s adoption of its first budget in nearly 4 years. I guess my friends on the other side of the aisle, the House Republicans, who had repeatedly beat up on the other Chamber for not doing its job with respect to the budget, are still dumbfounded that they in fact did pass one because it’s been 4 months and they still have yet to appoint Members to the conference committee they claim they wanted.

Then the Senate managed to pass bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform. Our Republican colleagues may talk a good game on immigration, but that’s all they’ve done so far here in the House. Not one of the bills in their piecemeal approach has come to this floor for consideration.

And just recently, House leaders allowed extreme partisanship to not only

derail what was originally a bipartisan farm bill, but to also cast aside a critical safety net that was founded on a bipartisan basis in both the Senate and the House decades ago to protect families who need help putting food on the table.

The list of unfinished business continues to grow as we enter the final days of summer, but where is the urgency to resolve them? I was puzzled to see House Republicans bring up a so-called “jobs” bill that once again provided less infrastructure funding than we did the previous year in what was called the T-HUD appropriation bill. Of course it wasn’t a surprise they had to pull it from the floor in the face of bipartisan opposition. Their parting shot of this week will be the 40th attempt to repeal part or all of ObamaCare. That’s 40.

When we return from this ill-timed recess, Congress will have just 9 legislative days to reach a deal on keeping the government open for business beyond the end of the fiscal year, and by that time we’re going to be bumping up against the debt ceiling. We actually managed a bipartisan accord to suspend that debt ceiling earlier this year, but we haven’t been able to rekindle that spirit of cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, the American people aren’t taking 5 weeks off like we are, and neither should this Congress. We can’t afford another lost summer.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time it’s my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law.

Mr. BACHUS. The gentleman from Fairfax, Virginia, has just told us that we have avoided the fiscal cliff. I wonder if our children and grandchildren can take any comfort in that. I had no idea that the deficit and the debt had gone away. I had been told they were increasing by billions of dollars every day.

We have another difference of opinion across the aisle. Our colleagues are saying we need more Federal regulations—those that are covered by this bill that cost \$100 million or more. We on this side of the aisle think that we could do well with a few less more regulations. Yes, every President has added regulations, every administration—and we’re supposed to say that that is a good thing?

Regulations today cost \$11,000 per American worker. Now, that’s not taxes; that’s not your Social Security; that’s not their expense. That is just the Federal regulations. Fourteen percent of our national income, according to Dr. Douglas Holtz-Eakin, our former Congressional Budget Office director, 14 percent of our national income is being absorbed by Federal regulations.

Now, the gentleman from Tennessee says there were all these regulations before, and the Obama administration, they passed very few regulations. Well, not according to Dr. Holtz-Eakin. He